

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending. Reconsideration and timely withdrawal of the pending rejections are requested for the reasons discussed below.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Over Naito, Kobayashi, Inaki and Fujita

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 19, 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,110 issued to NAITO et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,347 issued to KOBAYASHI et al. and U.S. Patent No. 5,835,916 issued to INAKI et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,544,052 issued to FUJITA et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, Applicant submits that no proper combination of these documents discloses or suggest at least the features of claims 1, 6 and 10.

In particular, independent claim 1 recites:

A system for managing an object positioned in a management area in a building, the system comprising

a host computer comprising a database which stores map data of the management area and position data of a tangible object to be managed in relation to attribute data of the object to be managed used for identifying the object to be managed, the position data including coordinate data comprising starting points "X" and "Y" and end points "X" and "Y" for each object to be managed, wherein the coordinate data for each object to be managed is related to the map data;

a portable terminal machine configured to specify the object to be managed, among a plurality of objects to be managed;

wherein the portable terminal machine displays a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map according to the coordinate data in the database transferred from the host computer to the portable

terminal machine and the physical surrounding attributes.

Also, independent claim 6 recites:

A retrieval system structured and arranged to manage an object positioned in a management area, comprising:

a host computer including a database, which database is output by the host computer on request, in which retrieval information and position information of tangible objects to be managed in the management area are held in relation to each other; and

a portable terminal machine for receiving and storing the database output by the host computer;

a map display unit displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information, the floor map including physical attributes of both the object to be managed and attributes of an environment surrounding the object to be managed.

Finally, independent claim 10 recites:

Apparatus for managing data of a tangible object to be managed in a management area of a building, the apparatus comprising:

a database storing unit for storing a database that includes map data used to display a map of an area of the management area of the building in which an object to be managed is positioned, position data of a display mark that denotes the position of the object to be managed on the map, and attribute data used to identify the object to be managed;

a map display unit displaying the map of the area according to the map data in the database and displaying the position and shape of the object on the map.

With regard to claim 1, Applicant submits that each of NAITO, KOBAYASHI, INAKI and FUJITA fail to teach or suggest a system for managing a tangible object positioned in a management area in a building. Applicant notes that NAITO merely discloses an information reporting system that is used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54). KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for managing an object positioned in a management area in a building. INAKI relates to a document preparation

apparatus and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a system for managing an object positioned in a management area in a building. FUJITA relates to map projection system which utilizes coordinates of longitude and latitude, and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a system for managing an object positioned in a management area in a building. These documents are also silent with regard to a host computer comprising a database which stores map data of the management area and position data of an object to be managed in relation to attribute data of the object to be managed used for identifying the object to be managed, the position data including coordinate data comprising starting points “X” and “Y” and end points “X” and “Y” for each object to be managed, wherein the coordinate data for each object to be managed is related to the map data, much less, that the portable terminal machine displays a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map according to the coordinate data in the database transferred from the host computer to the portable terminal machine and the physical surrounding attributes.

Applicant takes particular issue with the Examiner’s assertion (on page 5 of the Office Action) that NAITO teaches displaying a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map at col. 2, lines 28-34. This language merely states the following:

The data processing means executes predetermined data processing based upon the information received from the host computer, and the display means displays an image corresponding to data obtained by the data processing on the screen thereof. Consequently, the user of the portable terminal can obtain appropriate information regarding circumstances at his or her location.

Clearly, this language says absolutely nothing with regard to displaying a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map.

With regard to claim 6, Applicant submits that each of NAITO, KOBAYASHI, INAKI and FUJITA fail to teach or suggest a retrieval system structured and arranged to manage a tangible object positioned in a management area which includes a map display unit displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information, the floor map including physical attributes of both the object to be managed and attributes of an environment surrounding the object to be managed. Again, Applicant notes that while NAITO discloses an information reporting system that is used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54) that can be used to display an outdoor map (see Fig. 12), it does not teach or suggest a map display unit displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information. KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information. INAKI relates to a document preparation apparatus and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a map display unit displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information. Finally, FUJITA relates to map projection system which utilizes coordinates of longitude and latitude, and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a map display unit displaying one of plural floor maps of the management area and a

{P26829 00516728.DOC}

position where the particular object is located on the one floor map according to the position information.

With regard to claim 10, Applicant submits that each of NAITO, KOBAYASHI, INAKI and FUJITA fail to teach or suggest an apparatus for managing data of a tangible object to be managed in a management area of a building. Again, Applicant notes that NAITO merely discloses an information reporting system that is used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54). KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for managing an object in a management area of a building. INAKI relates to a document preparation apparatus and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a system for managing an object in a management area of a building. Finally, FUJITA relates to map projection system which utilizes coordinates of longitude and latitude, and has no apparent disclosure pertaining to a system for managing an object in a management area of a building. These documents are also silent with regard to a database storing unit for storing a database that includes map data used to display a map of an area of the management area of the building in which an object to be managed is positioned, position data of a display mark that denotes the position of the object to be managed on the map, and attribute data used to identify the object to be managed.

Finally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-5, 11, 12, 19, 21 and 22 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Over Naito with Kobayashi

Claims 7-9, 13-18, 20 and 23-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,867,110 issued to NAITO et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,347 issued to KOBAYASHI et al. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

In particular, Applicant submits that no proper combination of these documents discloses or suggest at least the features of claims 7, 13 and 17.

Specifically, independent claim 7 recites:

A portable position display apparatus structured and arranged to display a position of a tangible object to be managed in relation to a management area in a building, comprising:

a data storing unit for storing a database that includes map data used to display a map of an area of the management area in the building in which the object to be managed is positioned, position data used to locate the object to be managed on the map, and attribute data used to identify the object to be managed, wherein the position data is stored in relation to the attribute data;

a map display unit displaying the map of the area and a position of the object to be managed on the map according to the map data and the position data in the database when a match is identified by the searching unit.

Still further, independent claim 13 recites:

A position display method, comprising the steps of:

storing a database that includes map data used to display an area of management area of a building in which a plurality of tangible objects to be managed are placed as a map, position data used to display a position of each of the plurality of objects to be managed in the area on the map, and attribute data used to identify each object to be managed in a locally unique way;

prompting a user of a portable terminal to specify a specific object to be managed from among the plurality of objects to be managed;

reading the map data and the position data of the specific object to be managed from the database; and

displaying the position of the specific object to be managed in the area on the map on the portable terminal according to the map data and the position data read from the database.

Finally, independent claim 17 recites:

A computer readable storage medium that stores a program to be executed by a computer, the program enabling the computer to execute:

a first process for displaying a map on a portable terminal based on map data and on position data of a tangible object that is positioned and managed in a specific area of management area of a building, wherein the map data and the position data are stored in a database;

a second process for drawing a display mark of the object to be managed using the portable terminal according to an input from a user that specifies the object to be managed from among a plurality of objects to be managed on the map;

a third process for obtaining coordinate data of the drawn display mark on the map; and

a fourth process for storing the coordinate data in the database in relation to entered data of the object.

With regard to claim 7, Applicant submits that each of NAITO and KOBAYASHI fail to teach or suggest a portable position display apparatus structured and arranged to display a position of a tangible object to be managed in relation to a management area in a building. Applicant notes that NAITO merely discloses an information reporting system that is used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54). KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for managing an object positioned in a management area in a building. These documents are also silent with regard to a data storing unit for storing a database that includes map data used to display a map of an area of the management area in the building in which the object to be managed is positioned, position data used to locate the object to be managed on the map, and attribute data used to identify the object to be managed, wherein the position data is stored in relation to the attribute data.

Applicant takes issue with the Examiner's assertion (on page 12 of the Office Action) that

NAITO teaches display a map of an area of the management area in the building at col. 10, lines 25-27. The language of col. 10, lines 22-27 merely states the following:

Further, the data processing unit 24 refers to the position information data indicative of its own current position of the portable terminal 12, the disaster point information data 208 and the like to specify an area in the map to be displayed on the screen of the display unit 22 so as to read out appropriate map data from the map database.

Clearly, this language says absolutely nothing with regard to displaying a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map.

Applicant also takes issue with the Examiner's assertion (on page 12 of the Office Action) that NAITO teaches a map display unit displaying the map of the area and a position of the object to be managed on the map according to the map data and the position data in the database when a match is identified by the searching unit at col. 10, lines 25-27.

Clearly, the language on col. 10, lines 22-27 (which is noted above) says absolutely nothing with regard to displaying a map of the management area in the building and a position of the object to be managed on the map according to the map data and the position data in the database when a match is identified by the searching unit.

With regard to claim 13, Applicant submits that each of NAITO and KOBAYASHI fail to teach or suggest storing a database that includes map data used to display an area of management area of a building in which a plurality of tangible objects to be managed are placed as a map, position data used to display a position of each of the plurality of objects to be managed in the area on the map, and attribute data used to identify each object to be managed in a locally unique way. Again, Applicant notes that NAITO merely discloses an information reporting system that is

used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54). KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for managing an object in a management area of a building.

With regard to claim 17, Applicant submits that each of NAITO and KOBAYASHI fail to teach or suggest a first process for displaying a map on a portable terminal based on map data and on position data of a tangible object that is positioned and managed in a specific area of management area of a building, wherein the map data and the position data are stored in a database. Again, Applicant notes that NAITO merely discloses an information reporting system that is used in an outdoor environment (see col. 1, lines 46-54). KOBAYASHI has not been shown to disclose that the synchronous processing system is utilized for managing an object in a management area of a building.

Finally, Applicant submits that dependent claims 8, 9, 11, 12, 14-16, 18, 20 and 23-25 are allowable at least for the reason that these claims depend from allowable base claims and because these claims recite additional features that further define the present invention.

Applicant requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejection of the above-noted claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicant submits that all of the claims are patentably distinct from the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below, if needed.

P26829.A11

Please charge any deficiencies in fees and credit any overpayment of fees to **IBM Deposit**

Account 09-0457.

Respectfully submitted,
Shingo KURAMOCHI

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Andrew M. Calderon', written over a horizontal dashed line.

Andrew M. Calderon
Reg. No. 38,093

August 28, 2008
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C.
1950 Roland Clarke Place
Reston, VA 20191
703-716-1191